DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 821 JC 740 277

TITLE	Faculty in an Innovative Community College.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	Topical Pap-45
PUB DATE	Sep 74
NOTE	34p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Educational Technology; *Instructional Innovation; Participant Involvement; Post Secondary Education; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the findings of an attempt to identify elements in one community college that influenced teachers' choice of instructional methods and styles. The college studied was an innovative institution, focusing special attention on audio-tutorial instruction (multimedia systems), computer assisted instruction, and instructional television. Using the participant observation method, the process by which 125 full-time faculty members accepted or rejected innovations was examined. The faculty members are categorized into four types: Uninhibited Innovators, Hesitant Innovators, Uninvolved Non-Innovators, and Alienated Non-Innovators. The results of the study focus on the need of the faculty for a sense of autonomy in their work situation and the support and protection of their peers before adopting instructional practices foreign to them. (DB)

ED 094821

JC 740 277

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FACULTY IN AN INNOVATIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Leslie Purdy

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

Topical Paper No. 45
September 1974

This Document May Be Reproduced For Further Distribution at Will

TOPICAL PAPERS

1. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education. Jly 1968. ED 022 479.
2. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; No. 2: Attitude Assessment. Nov 1968. ED 026 050.
3. Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines. Dec 1968. ED 026 039.
4. Students as Teachers. Jan 1969. ED 026 999.
5. Is Anyone Learning to Write? Feb 1969. ED 030 422.
6. Is It Really a Better Technique? March 1969. ED 030 410.
7. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; No. 3: Concept Formation. Aug 1969. ED 032 072.
8. The Junior College in International Perspective. Jan 1970. ED 035 417.
9. Identifying the Effective Instructor. Jan 1970. ED 035 416.
10. Financing Higher Education: A Proposal. Feb 1970. ED 037 206.
11. The Person: A Conceptual Synthesis. March 1970. ED 037 219.
12. The Position Papers of Black Student Activists. Sep 1970. ED 042 453.
13. Case Studies in Multi-Media Instruction. Oct 1970. ED 044 098.
14. The Laws Relating to Higher Education in the Fifty States. January 1965-December 1967. Oct 1970. ED 044 097.
15. Nationwide Pilot Study on Articulation. Dec 1970. ED 045 065.
16. The President's Reaction to Black Student Activism. Jan 1971. ED 046 390.
17. The Dynamic Interaction of Student and Teacher. Feb 1971. ED 046 395.
18. Directions for Research and Innovation in Junior College Reading Programs. Feb 1971. ED 046 396.
19. Some Philosophical and Practical Concepts for Broadening the Base of Higher Education in Virginia. April 1971. ED 049 729.
20. Skill Development in Junior College Reading Programs. May 1971. ED 048 060.

21. Community College Reading Center Facilities. May 1971. ED 051 792.

22. Black Studies as a Curriculum Catalyst. May 1971. ED 050 709.

23. Exemplary Practices in Junior College Reading Instruction. May 1971. ED 050 710.

24. Training Faculty for Junior College Reading Programs. May 1971. ED 050 711.

25. Extending Environmental Research to the Community College. Aug 1971. ED 053 724.

26. A Student Volunteer Services Bureau. Aug 1971. ED 053 719.

27. The College of the Whole Earth. Oct 1971. ED 055 588.

28. The Professional President: A Decade of Community Junior College Chief Executives. Jan 1972. ED 058 881.

29. The Financial Crisis In the Community College. Feb 1972. ED 058 873.

30. The Practitioner Views Institutional Research. Feb 1972. ED 059 718.

31. After the Open Door: An Approach to Developmental Education. March 1972. ED 059 714.

32. Group Counseling of Minority and Low-Income Women Students: A Model Program for Community College Educators. March 1972. ED 059 715.

33. The Who, What, Why of Instructor Evaluation. April 1972. ED 060 839.

34. Do Students Want Individualized Instruction? July 1972. ED 063 931.

35. Study and Travel Programs Abroad: Guidelines for Two-Year College Students. July 1972. ED 063 914.

36. Personality Orientations and Vocational Choice in Community College Students. Dec 1973. ED 083 979.

37. A Comparison of the Personality Characteristics of Community College Dropouts and Persisters. Dec 1973. ED 083 980.

38. The Department/Division Structure in the Community College. Dec 1973. ED 085 051.

39. The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in Community Colleges. March 1974. ED 089 811.

40. The Department/Division Chairman: Characteristics and Role in the College. May 1974.

41. Three Colleges: Three Faculties. Jan 1974.
42. The Role of the Academic Dean. July 1974.
43. The Do Everything College. Aug 1974.
44. World Game Study in the Community College. Sep 1974.
45. Faculty in an Innovative College. Sep 1974.

For information on obtaining copies of the above Topical Papers, contact the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. U.C.L.A.

The material in this Topical Paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S., Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the League for Innovation in the Community College for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the League for Innovation in the Community College or the National Institute of Education.

FACULTY IN AN INNOVATIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by
Leslie Purdy

Calls for faculty members to be innovative and creative in their teaching fall as regularly as summer rain in the tropics. But faculty responses to these calls are considerably less reliable. Why are some instructors constantly experimenting with new teaching forms while others, year after year stay with their old methods? Can instructor reaction be traced to characteristics of the college environment?

This paper reports the findings of an attempt to identify elements in one college that influenced teachers' choices of instructional methods and styles. By reputation and proclamation, the college studied was an innovative institution, focusing special attention on such technological developments as audio-tutorial instruction (multi-media systems), computer assisted instruction and instructional television.

Background of the Study

Undertaken in the 1972-73 school year, this study used the participant observation methodology. Eight months were spent on the college campus observing instructors in their every day work, attending formal meetings, participating in informal groups, and interviewing college staff members. Since this was an exploratory study, I did not begin with predetermined hypotheses about the phenomenon to be studied but attempted instead to develop a model of the process by which teachers accept or reject innovations. The emphasis was on identifying the social influences--from peer and from the institution--which have impact on instructor's decisions regarding their teaching methods. No attempt was made to objectively evaluate instructional innovations at the college.

In addition to being useful for exploratory research,

another advantage of participant observation is that it permits examination of the choice of instructional methods over a period of time. As Glaser points out, this method "...facilitates the generation of theories of process, sequence, and change which pertain to organizations, positions, and social interaction" (1969, p. 226). Being in the field situation over a period of months allowed me to consider the possibility that an instructor's choice of teaching methods could vary according to changes around him, (for example, in the organization itself) or changes in the teacher's position with regard to other teachers. A survey or one-shot interview would not have permitted such exploration.

A detailed description of participant observation methodology, its usefulness for educational research and the details of conducting this particular study, can be found in Purdy (1973). While it has been used most by the disciplines of sociology and anthropology, its use in this study showed it to be helpful in generating educational theory and producing information on educational organizations.

Investigating the process of instructors adoption or rejection of various instructional practices was prompted by several theoretical considerations. First, research on the teaching process must be attentive to the informal organization of a school as well as the formal structure which appears on flow charts and in policy manuals. Friendship patterns, unofficial communication channels, rumors, and other features of organizational life such as morale of participants are of great significance in any organization. Research which looks at how the formal organization supports or inhibits innovation will only see a part of the situation. Elements in the informal life of the institution can support or negate institutional policies and inject new goals into the formal system. The studies of how informal organization of workers have controlled the level

of production in industry are well known. The research on diffusion of innovations through both groups and organizations also stresses the importance of the informal communication links on both the rate and direction of the spread of new ideas (Katz, 1969; Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1964; Coleman, Katz and Menzel, 1966).

What kinds of informal activities could be relevant to teachers' choices of instructional methods? Some examples come from Gaff and Wilson's (1971) review of the teaching environment in higher education. They cite a study in which faculty were asked to identify factors in the environment that have a significant impact on teaching. The respondents noted such conditions as the competency of colleagues, the supportive or negative feedback from peers and department heads, and the general intellectual climate of a department as being very important to their teaching. Faculty peer groups have a great deal of influence on what behavior will be rewarded and condoned, on sources of information, and on stimulating or suppressing teacher development in research or teaching. Thus, attention must be given to peer group influence on the teaching process as at least one part of the informal environment of a school.

In addition to understanding the teaching environment in terms of the informal organization and the role of peer groups, consideration must be given to the nature of resistance. A major study of the reaction to a technological innovation by higher education faculty was made by Evans and Leppmann in their book, Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education (1970). Theorizing that resistance in part depends upon the degree to which potential adopters felt the innovation was consistent with their existing values and past experiences, these researchers categorized faculty according to their position (for, or against or neutral) toward the introduction of instructional television to a university. The ideas that resistance

was an immediate reaction of many instructors and that resistance can be part of the climate of an organization were central to their report.

A different view of resistance comes from a study of an attempt to implement a major change in teaching methods in a secondary school. Gross, Giacquinta and Bernstein (1968 and 1970) found that resistance was not the immediate reaction of the teachers but rather one which developed as participating teachers encountered organizational obstacles and became frustrated with the time and extra work involved in changing their practices. Their conclusion seems useful for the study discussed in this paper:

> The degree to which organizational members are resistant to change needs to be taken as problematic, rather than as a 'given' in theoretical formulations of the successful implementation of organizational innovations (1970, p. 704).

A similar idea is presented by Lauer (1971). He notes that we must assume the theoretical possibility that people and organizations are not inherently resistant before we can understand the nature of and conditions under which resistance appears.

Another problem in understanding institutional change and innovations concerns the status and rank of the people involved. Are they employees who are basically implementing decisions made by higher authorities? Or are they at an organizational level where they either participate in the decision or can themselves decide to experiment with an innovative practice? It would seem that the patterns of acceptance or rejection of innovations by the former group would be different from those of the latter. It is possible that the perception by faculty of the source of an innovation--whether it arises from teachers' suggestions or administrative decision--can alter the reaction of faculty to that innovation.

Baldridge (1972) reminds us of another variable that must

be considered in a study of changes in teaching practices, the variable of conflict. Some theories of organizational change have seen conflict as the result of lack of communication within a system, and in that sense it seems to have little relationship to adoption and rejection of innovations. Baldridge, however, maintains that "...in many cases, communication is perfectly clear, and the situation is one of genuine conflict, genuinely scarce resources, and genuine differences of opinion about goals" (p. 7). This view produces several possibilities, first that conflict itself may be a source or cause of organizational change. Second, when debates arise over implementation of innovations, attention is shifted to the process by which the conflict is resolved or a compromise reached rather than focusing on the final decision of acceptance or rejection. Thus, Baldridge suggests study of sub-groups within an organization, their relative powers, and the process by which the final decision may reflect the competition or cooperation between them.

"Electronic U."

The institution described in this paper, called Suburban College, is in some ways atypical of community colleges because of its newness and its avowed commitment to innovation. It is a public college in a two-college district close to a large metropolitan area. Enrollment in Suburban in 1972-73 exceeded 12,000 students, with over 6,000 of those attending the evening college and 7,700 taking less than ten semester hours of classes for credit.

Suburban fits the prevailing pattern of community colleges in that it is run by the administrators, not the faculty. Not only do college affairs reflect the leadership of the ten full-time campus administrators, but an additional nine administrators and forty classified personnel at the district office

also set policy for Suburban. The five members of the Board of Trustees make district-wide policies implemented by both district and campus-level administrators. While the two campuses are theoretically autonomous institutions, the district Chancellor and several of his assistants have strong educational and administrative views that have left their mark on Suburban's affairs. For example, before Suburban opened in 1966, the Chancellor challenged its leaders to be as innovative as possible, and he has specifically encouraged the technological emphasis of the innovations adopted.

The college has three councils which set policies intramurally: the President's Cabinet, the College Affairs Council (CAC), and the Council for Curriculum and Instruction (CCI). Representatives from all campus groups--students, faculty, and non-academic personnel--sit on these bodies which are chaired by the three top administrators (the "Triad")--the President, the Dean of College Affairs, and the Dean of Academic Affairs. The Triad, plus other campus administrators, provide an "umbrella" over these councils and handle day-to-day affairs.

Another level of organization exists on this campus. Faculty are divided by major curriculum categories into eight divisions: Business, Communications, Fine and Applied Arts, Health Sciences, Math-Sciences, Physical and Recreation Education, Social Science, and Technology. Run by a division chairman and sometimes an assistant or two, the divisions handle such teaching matters as course offerings and teacher assignments. Some larger divisions contain formal and informal subject-matter groups which plan and review courses in that discipline (e.g. the Math Council).

The Faculty Senate is not part of the formal governance structure. Composed of officers elected from the faculty as a whole plus representatives from each division, the Senate serves mainly as an advisory body to the administration and the three councils.

Several administrative practices at Suburban are designed to promote innovative practices. A Faculty Fellowship Program, for example, provides funds for supplies, equipment and expert assistance. The grants supply the resources and time to encourage an instructor to develop a project that a normal teaching load would not allow. Up to 20 fellowships have been granted each year since the program began in 1969, and this support has contributed to the development of courses and programs now seen as models of innovation--e.g., audio-tutorial biology, the typing laboratory, and computer-assisted instructional course segments in chemistry.

Other forms of administrative encouragement also exist. Funds are made available for summer instructional improvement projects, faculty travel and conference attendance, purchasing instructional hardware, technical support staff and for training and assisting teachers who are working with technological innovations. It is important to remember that while the college practices for fostering technological instruction were not a result of a conscious campus-wide faculty decision, neither were they the result of purely administrative priorities. The administration could always point to some faculty members' requests as a factor in the decision to invest in A-T materials, computer terminals, computer programmers, graphics experts and photographers.

Suburban enjoys its desired reputation for innovation but innovation of a particular kind. The college was called "Electronic U" by one journalist whose article suggested that all its teachers utilized technological devices. Visitors see the telecommunications center with its television studio, audio-tutorial labs, a computer services center and a library media center. While decisions to move into all these areas were made at different times and often for unrelated reasons, the total effect is that instruction at Suburban does, indeed,

seem an electronic process. And yet, a majority of the instructors teach at least one traditional class using the lecture-discussion method, and perhaps as many as half of the faculty have not done more than dabble with media. Suburban's reputation results in part from the fact that technological teaching devices are visible and can be easily demonstrated while non-technological instructional experiments, such as team-teaching and inter-disciplinary courses, are less dramatic.

The Faculty

This study focused on the 125 full-time faculty members at Suburban College. The training and career backgrounds of these instructors generally fits the national patterns of two-year college teachers. The majority have Masters degrees with less than ten percent holding doctorates. Many of the new instructors have just completed graduate programs or have held instructional associate jobs at Suburban previous to being hired as full-time instructors. Others come from high school or junior college teaching, or work in a non-education occupation preparatory to teaching in a vocational-technical field. Most of the faculty are new to the district, having worked there five or less years, and appear to be quite youthful. Since few instructors are approaching retirement, very few positions will be available each year for new instructors unless the college continues to grow.

For several reasons faculty life at Suburban is disunified and decentralized: The campus is large, with faculty separated into self-contained units according to divisional or subject-matter organization; few formal occasions occur where faculty might meet and discuss issues; and, the Faculty Senate is a weak body. But more important, the faculty have not had sufficient reason to unite. Feeling content with their jobs because of relatively good salaries and services, they do not want to upset a comfortable situation by confronting the

administration over trivial matters. Further, the image of the college as an open, friendly institution, with faculty and administrators sharing goals, has inhibited the development of a self-conscious faculty group. Faculty are encouraged to approach administrators through informal channels or on a one-to-one basis if they wish to influence administrative policy.

Resolution of conflicts that have occurred between faculty and administration has come through personal relationships and communication rather than through organizational arrangements. However, dependence on personal friendship to solve problems, beneficial only for faculty who feel on open terms with an administrator, detracts from the usefulness of the formal procedures. While the establishment a few years ago of Faculty-Administrative Communications groups resolved some personality clashes and policy disagreements, they did not help solve group differences. In other words, the Communications groups are no substitute for governance, and their effect has been to obviate the formation of a strong faculty organization.

The faculty at Suburban can be characterized as being generally unaware and uninterested in campus-wide issues. They appear passive about administrative control of governance and unorganized in regard to present employment conditions. There is little communication between divisions. Only rarely do they speak of themselves as a "faculty" in the sense of a self-conscious affiliation.

In contrast to this lack of campus-wide organization and conscious perspective, the divisions and subject-matter groups are centers of faculty activities and concerns. Here, the faculty are participants, not observers. The eight divisions and the larger subject-matter areas within those divisions (mathematics, English, and biology) are where instructors spend most time and have closest professional and personal friends. While at the campus level the faculty have little power, at the

division level they expect to participate in decision-making and are very sensitive to any tampering with what they perceive as their area of authority. Characteristics of the divisions and smaller groups include faculty loyalty to each other, to division chairmen and to their teaching field; formal and informal communication networks; frequent discussion of work in a collegial atmosphere; rivalry and competition between individuals and groups of faculty; and conscious pulling together against any threat to an individual's or group's decision-making domain. The divisions and subject-matter areas are crucial in shaping faculty attitudes, resolving conflicts, and defining everyday conditions of work.

In some ways, the strength and importance of the divisions are the result of administrative policy. The administration originally hoped to prevent the creation of many small departments that could be detrimental to institutional and curricular flexibility. Thus, they planned the divisions as administrative and teaching units, each with a division chairman, its own budget, and influence over the teaching of its courses. But the administration is not completely satisfied with the arrangement. On one hand, they are pleased that the faculty cooperate and affiliate across subject-matter lines--for example, police science teachers are in the Social Science division and thus can discuss divisional issues with instructors in more traditional academic areas. On the other hand, the divisions have also isolated teachers, preventing communication with instructors in other divisions. It seems that the administration is caught in the bind of wanting faculty to work together as a whole to develop interdisciplinary courses but not to organize as a governing or bargaining unit on issues relating to salary and working conditions.

Faculty Work Space

Faculty members believe they should have jurisdiction

over certain areas of their work. They want primary control of their classes--the type of room, how the course is taught, the textbooks--and partial control over, or at least participation in discussions about divisional and college matters affecting their work (e.g. budget, purchase of new equipment, and appointment of a division chairman). Since the instructors are aware that conditions outside their control impinge on their teaching--such as trustees' decisions, state legislation, and student interests and fads--they do not believe they have sole authority. But over those areas where they feel they should have primary influence, they are **vehement** about protecting their work space from interference by any outsider.

The phrase "work space" is helpful in representing the faculty domain of influence and authority on the job. Not all faculty members define their work space in the same manner. For example, at Suburban, the music teachers feel they should have a say in setting concert dates, prices charged, and policy on music tours. One instructor, for example, was very upset that the administration had usurped this part of his work space. Other instructors are most sensitive about controlling course planning, for example, the right to choose course materials. Work space also refers to a physical locale. At Suburban, the Math-Science and Health Science teachers clashed several times over sharing classrooms. Here is a case of faculty impinging on the work space of other faculty; the administration is not the only threat to one's perceived domain.

An instructor's concern with work space is concentric, moving from his own area of control and authority plus that of his peers in a subject-matter area, to concern for his division, and finally concern for the collective work space of all instructors on his campus. A basic requirement for faculty job satisfaction and contentment is a set of guarantees that protect both collective and individual work space. This protection

comes in the form of job contracts and legal guarantees, as well as in unwritten informal agreements and arrangements. One hindrance to formation of a strong faculty organization is that such a group could potentially interfere with an individual instructor's work space. Faculty are not willing to give up control over their work space to a faculty organization unless greater threat to their freedom is perceived.

The reaction of the faculty in the 1972-73 school year to the construction of the television studio on campus illustrates faculty moving from individual fear of losing freedom in choosing an instructional technique to a collective, campus-wide reaction. Some background information is necessary to understand the significance of the faculty's reaction to the studio. Most instructional innovations on the Suburban campus requiring technology were adopted fairly gradually over its seven year history. Audio-tutorial (A-T) was first--experimented initially in biology and then in remedial English. While the administration favored use of A-T, it espoused a philosophy of instructor's right to choose his or her own teaching techniques as a way of defending the few teachers using A-T from attacks by other faculty members. Computer assisted instruction (C.A.I.) was the next innovation; terminals were brought in and some instructors became involved with this technique. While the campus developed a reputation for its creative use of technology in instruction, teachers still believed that they could take or leave the innovations as they saw fit. Faculty not experimenting with these innovations in divisions where use of media was popular felt more pressure from peers than from the administration.

In 1972, at the urging of the Chancellor, the district began construction of a television studio on the Suburban campus. This facility was to be for broadcasting public television to the county as well as for the production of instructional materials. Which of these purposes had priority was unclear to the

faculty, most of whom paid little attention to it since it was not specifically a college facility. The Suburban president was not to direct it; control came from the district. A large staff moved in and began to function, and daily broadcasting began in October, 1972. The Suburban faculty returned to campus for fall orientation to find much attention being paid to the "Suburban television studio." The Chancellor's speech at orientation dwelled on the great potential of educational television, and some instructors began to feel subtle enticements to move into this area of instructional media. A display of one of the potential uses of television color cassettes for classes was given, and the faculty heard descriptions of colleagues who were in full production of televised courses. Thus, the introduction of the idea of using television in instruction differed greatly from the introduction of A-T and C.A.I. The decision to put money into a studio was made by the district, not the campus administration or faculty. Furthermore, it was an abrupt and obvious reality and did not reflect gradual adoption by a few teachers with colleagues having time to adapt to the new idea.

Reaction grew against the studio, but more importantly, against the way it had come to be on campus. After a display of the use of T.V. color cassettes, a group of teachers from several divisions debated many aspects of the television studio. One faculty member, noting that it was the Chancellor's project rather than a faculty decision, was answered by a colleague, "But you know, you don't <u>have</u> to use any of it. That's <u>always</u> our decision. [Pause] And yet we are at a turning point it seems; once the campus is all hardware, then we will no longer have a choice." Thus, this instructor saw the movement toward television as part of a movement toward hardware in general. On one hand, she was saying that there was no cause for faculty concern because their right to choose <u>not</u> to use the innovations remained. On the other hand, she was beginning to realize that if the campus made a substantial enough investment

in hardware, the freedom to choose might be lost. The television might be the turning point.

Another instructor commented that "The difference between T.V. and other things is that with the other stuff, you could try it out, play around, do a slide-tape segment and it wasn't all that expensive. T.V. is big from the beginning." He did not mind the college's investment in other equipment because if, after a few years, the faculty evaluated its effectiveness and decided against it, conceivably the commitment to hardware could be rescinded. But there was a fear that television was irreversible; even if its usefulness was evaluated in ten years and found wanting, the college was stuck with it. Revealed in this and other conversations was the feeling that teachers could experiment with other techniques and if they did not do well or even failed with them, they did not lose too much money or pride. But, there was no room for practice with televised instruction. Faculty using it received greater exposure; it was not an experiment but the final show right from the start.

All these feelings hinged around the fear that the faculty right to choose an instructional technique was being restricted--there was an intrusion in their work space for two reasons. For one, the decision to invest resources in this innovation and not another one was made without faculty participation or approval. Further, once installed on campus, pressure would be applied for faculty to use it. The administration could use many ways of recognizing and rewarding faculty who moved into approved instructional innovations.

Other gripes and complaints also developed and there were disagreements between faculty and the television staff. Some campus administrators resented the presence of a unit on campus not answerable to them. In the Winter of 1973, an indignant faculty member told me of a Board of Trustees meeting where a motion to fund faculty sabbaticals was turned down while a

mobile television unit was financed for over $350,000. Rather than being defeated, the sabbatical proposal had actually been returned to committee for further study, but the teacher interpreted the situation as a clear indication of the Board's priorities. Faculty resentment grew to the point that the Faculty Senate was activated and went to the Board with a set of "76" demands in the Spring of 1972. The Board sidetracked the demands, but the district and the College began efforts to alleviate the tension. The growth of a campus-wide faculty movement, though temporary and for a particular issue, demonstrates how sensitive faculty are to threats to their collective work space.

While reaction to the television studio was the first instance of collective reaction to a perceived threat to their work space--in this case, their autonomy to decide on instructional methods--the faculty demonstrated a sensitivity to interference in other ways. Often teachers tied their reaction to an innovation on campus to their perception of whether the faculty had a choice in adopting it. Faculty who felt A-T or C.A.I. or other practices had been forced onto them were also critical of these innovations. On the other hand, faculty perceiving autonomy to choose teaching methods had a positive or at least neutral attitude toward the campus innovations. Even those instructors who did not use the innovations themselves felt they were good and useful for others to use as long as there was freedom in selecting them.

The sensitivity of faculty to interference in their work space suggests a relationship between faculty autonomy and their acceptance of administration-sponsored innovations. To the extent the administration shows regard for those areas of an instructor's domain that he feels are crucial, he is likely to accept the administration's suggestions and hardware. In other words, a quid pro quo relationship exists with understanding of and respect for work space on one side and adoption of

new techniques on the other. The administration's posture is most crucial because the faculty believes it can effect other forces interfering with individual teacher's work. To the faculty, one of the most disturbing aspects of the dispute over the television studio was that the district had largely ignored the Suburban administration, thus prompting the extraordinary response of the faculty going directly to the Board. Before this, the faculty believed that the administration was committed to faculty autonomy in the area of instruction and would intercede to block or soften interference coming from the district or from the community. Thus, teachers expected not only that the administration should refrain from interfering with the faculty right to choose instructional methods, but also that a good administration should block other forms of interference.

Since both perceived administrative support and protection of faculty autonomy and faculty attitudes toward innovation run from positive to negative, a four-way typology is here proposed: Uninhibited Innovators, Hesitant Innovators, Uninvolved Non-Innovators, and Alienated Non-Innovators. A description of each group follows.

Uninhibited Innovators

These faculty members see the administration as basically supportive, feel their work space is protected, and are enthusiastic about campus innovations. By self-description and reputation, they are innovators who have all developed audio-tutorial courses, labs, computer-assisted instructional programs, or video segments for classes. None have experienced rejection of an idea or proposal, and they have readily taken advantage of the Faculty Fellowships available. Quick to credit the administration for Suburban's reputation as an innovative campus, they have high regard for the administration and freely praise the president and deans for being supportive.

Instructors in this group are content because they receive funding, equipment, and administrative encouragement for their projects but many are isolated from their faculty colleagues. During the early years when they were leaders in changing traditional teaching methods, they had borne the brunt of much faculty hostility; they needed and received administrative support. While overt resentment against "impersonal teaching" methods has largely subsided and clusters of faculty using audio-tutorial systems and computers on campus now exist, these instructors who completely support the administration tend to be loners. Some are loners because they have been promoted to administrative posts--the Director of Learning Resources or division chairmanships, while others are loners because they continue to experiment with each new hardward development as it comes out, thus continuing their separation from the majority of the faculty. A few seem to be loners by personal choice; they prefer solo experimenting with new ideas rather than team efforts, another quality which makes them a bit suspect by other faculty. Their dependence on administrative rather than faculty support can only increase; they realize they need the administration in order to continue their work.

Hesitant Innovators

These instructors are suspicious of the administration and feel continual vigilance of faculty autonomy is necessary; they express either a neutral or favorable opinion of the campus innovations and have experimented with some innovative teaching methods. Most faculty at Suburban are hesitant innovators. Because they tend to be strongly committed to whatever innovation they work on, they draw a lot of attention to themselves. All are very willing to talk about their newest instructional concerns. Several hold formal and informal leadership roles with the faculty and are active in the Faculty Senate, while one is a division chairman.

Unlike the uninhibited innovators, these people see fundamental differences in opinion and concerns between the faculty and the college administration. While several have personal friendships with individual administrators, they always distinguish administrative from faculty perspectives. Some actively distrust all administrators as a matter of principle while others have become suspicious of the motives of specific Suburban administrators, often perceiving a reduction in administrative support for one of their innovations.

Some hesitant innovators characterize the administration as being concerned with the appearance, not the reality of innovation. "They use the word a lot but really don't know what's going on," said one, a condemnation which was a source of great amusement to him and his friends. Closely related to this judgment is one by a colleague who feels the administration is concerned with a particular innovation because it holds the promise of saving money. "The administration has a concern with cost-effectiveness. That's their job. If you can do the same job for less, good. They deny it but it's true." Faculty, on the other hand, believe that they are primarily concerned with whether the innovation is actually a better instructional method. Some hesitant innovators who believe the administration has been manipulative and devious in working with some teachers are also cynical regarding the motives and actions of these administrators, no matter how amiable the relations between the two groups. Nevertheless, some members of the group are innovative and creative.

The hesitant innovators are distinguished from the alienated non-innovators by a feeling of relative security. Accepting that the administration may not be completely trustworthy and should be kept at a distance from the faculty work space, nonetheless, these teachers find a secure enough environment in

which to teach as they want. They have enough freedom even though many of them wish for more. This protection of their work space comes from several sources: large and powerful divisions, division chairmen who defend faculty rights, the potential use of the Senate; personal arrangements such as friendship with one administrator; and establishment of work spaces in which the administration has little interest.

A final characteristic of the hesitant innovators is that they place high value on colleagueship among teachers. Unlike the uninhibited innovators, there are no loners in this group; where they have experimented with innovations, they have done it in teams. Several are spokesmen for greater faculty participation in governance and are leaders in the Faculty Senate. At one time, several may have been uninhibited innovators but, sensing administrative favor of certain innovations over others, they have become members of groups of instructors pressuring for continued administrative funds for their work.

Uninvolved Non-Innovators

These faculty members see the administration as supportive and do not fear interference, but for a variety of other reasons are not interested in campus innovations. Actually, this group is comprised of two types of faculty: new instructors who have not yet committed themselves to an instructional approach and older ones who use one instructional method only. None of them express dissatisfaction with or suspicion of the administration--in fact, many new instructors in this category are in awe of the support services provided faculty and conclude that the administration will do anything to encourage innovation. While others are either suspicious of the technology or curious, most are busy adjusting to their jobs, sometimes their first college position, and have little time left to learn how to use a slide-tape carousel or write a test to be

computerized. The new uninvolved non-innovators typically do not remain in this category for long but come under the influence of a strong faculty personality who encourages them in one direction or another.

The older faculty in the uninvolved non-innovator group have taught for years and have been at Suburban long enough to establish their reputation for not being interested in any instructional method other than lecture-discussion, book reading and tests. Some are isolated from their peers and apathetic about the whole college atmosphere, though they do not express particular criticism of the innovations, just a lack of interest. And some are respected by their colleagues because they have withstood both peer and administrative pressure to try some innovative practice. Other faculty often consider these traditionalists to be good at what they do.

Alienated Non-Innovators

These faculty members feel the administration dominates faculty work space completely and that faculty have little autonomy. They have a negative reaction to campus innovations. Few faculty at Suburban actually can be classified as completely alienated non-innovators since this is an uncomfortable position that cannot be tolerated for long. Some instructors in this group make various arrangements to allow themselves to teach with acceptable autonomy, while others become apathetic and still others quit or are fired. Several faculty have left the campus apparently because of dislike of the technological emphasis or incompatibility with the administration. Many alienated faculty, those who distrust the administration the most, are actually innovators unobtrusively pursuing an instructional approach they consider significantly innovative.

The alienated non-innovators hold strong views on the faculty's need for autonomy in their work. When pressed, one

instructor said that a requirement for job satisfaction was being able to do whatever he wanted in the classroom. He was cynical about the actual effect of the new technological media, concluding that these things did not really make any difference in the area where it mattered most, i.e., the student's motivation to learn.

The faculty who are most vocal in their criticism of the administration and technological campus innovations are well known on campus. Because of their respected academic training, maturity, and ability to articulate their opinions, they are tolerated--perhaps even respected--by both the administration and their peers. The basic complain expressed by one of these teachers (paraphrased from a long statement): "We know what we think is good teaching, but we aren't in a position to make the decisions about where to put the college money because of the governance structure here. So, in effect, the administration makes the decisions of what kind of teaching will be encouraged." Needless to say, these faculty disagree with the administration's priorities. If the issue of faculty representation in governance becomes a more widespread concern on campus, these alienated non-innovators may gain more influence with campus faculty members.

Conclusions

The major impression about this community college's faculty concerns their vision of the nature and requirements of their job. The faculty culture is based on the idea of the necessity of autonomy to do their work. All other findings must be seen in light of this observation. Faculty believe that teaching is an individual creative process, a very private and personal effort, and thus it should not be restricted by interference from non-teachers or even other teachers. This belief in the need for autonomy is a shared work ethic, a requirement which they believe produces the best teaching

and is personally most satisfying.

Teachers' concern to minimize interference in their work space is not a new finding in research on schools. Other studies have shown how high school teachers rely on administrators, for example, to block interference from parents and community groups, but this phenomenon has not heretofore been traced to community college instructors. Suburban teachers try to deal with external pressures (from the district or the community) as well as keep the college administration at a distance from their work. What is of particular significance here is seeing how much the choice of instructional methods is affected by the concern to protect and retain autonomy.

To protect their work space from interference, instructors have set up both formal and informal organizations that maximize their control of physical areas, supplies and equipment and shape work related ideas and practices. Acknowledging that varying degrees of administrative support are necessary to their functioning, the faculty attempt to define and direct the support flowing through their divisions so that administrators are kept at a distance. In addition to large and powerful divisions, teachers occasionally gain assistance from division chairmen, the Faculty Senate, close friendships with administrators, and the use of a teaching method or subject in which the administration has little interest.

Since intrusion on an instructor's work space can come from peers as well as from administrators, the faculty culture contains provisions that also set limits on one's colleagues. In the divisions and sub-groups, the teachers maintain the rules, alliances and compromises that protect teachers from each other. The actual protection from interference in a teacher's work can best be seen in the day-to-day discussions and negotiations between individuals and groups over working conditions, rules of work, control of equipment and space.

The most commonly known informal restriction on teachers is the prohibition against observing another teacher in the classroom unless given an invitation or specific advance approval by the teacher being observed.

An instructor's immediate peer group and even the larger faculty reference group at the college also have other effects. The peer group can provide or deprive instructors of information; it can filter or distort that information. Teachers hearing about instructional innovations via colleagues give the ideas and practices more serious consideration than if the information comes from non-teachers. The informal grapevine on campus is seen as providing more reliable information than any other source.

Faculty peer groups influence more than just the contents and accuracy of information, however. The groups have powerful rewards and sanctions that affect an individual's behavior and ideas. Such influence can inhibit or suppress a teacher who wants to experiment or deviate from group norms, but teachers also can challenge and support each other when a change in practices is considered. If a teacher who wants to experiment can find a few colleagues interested in the innovation, a group is formed that both supports the members and protects them from other teachers' criticism. Faculty members experimenting with new instructional methods require more moral support than instructors who are working with familiar and approved practices.

Other findings about the characteristics of the faculty sub-groups are important. The sub-groups may be relatively permanent or fluid; they may be based in a teaching discipline, a teaching style ("humanistic educators"), or a political necessity such as purchasing and controlling new equipment. Not only are there faculty sub-groups, but at times teacher groups also cooperate with administrators, counseling staff, student groups,

or support staff in trying to achieve certain ends.

Educational research and policy has often accepted the hierarchical model of education organizations, but the findings of this study suggest that model is too simplistic to account for organizational change. The old model requires that purposive change be introduced from the top of the organization down, and that other changes in the organization introduced at lower levels compete or conflict with basic organizational goals.

The discovery of the many functions served by faculty sub-groups is particularly interesting and the discovery of faculty sub-groups at Suburban is consistent with Baldridge's (1972) view of organizations as fragmented into many power blocs and interest groups. He argues that it is natural that these groups will try to influence policy so that institutional decisions reflect group values and goals. Furthermore, rather than seeing one elite group running all aspects of the organization, Baldridge suggests that "decisions may be divided up, with different elite groups controlling different decisions.... Decisions are not simple bureaucratic orders, but are instead negotiated compromises among competing groups. Officials are not free simply to order decisions; instead they have to jockey between interest groups, hoping to build viable compromises among powerful blocs" (p. 8).

Based on the research at Suburban, Baldridge's model of internal power blocs and interest groups seems a very realistic picture of community college organization. For example, although the Suburban administration wields considerable power, part of its success at introducing innovations is due to its alliances with various sub-groups on the campus. The Triad always knew of a few instructors who were anxious to use the media and hardware before the materials arrived on campus. These instructors, rather than the administration, became the advocates of the innovations. An alliance was formed which

was useful to both sides: the teachers got the funds and equipment to experiment with the new media (something their peers could not give) while the administration accomplished a goal of introducing the innovations without appearing autocratic in the traditional faculty domain of instruction.

Thus, this model sees an organization consisting of fluid groups, conflicts, alliances and compromises which make up the process by which the organization changes. What is important to a teacher's sense of security is that at any one time, he believes that his group has the potential or actual power to protect his own work space. Otherwise, that person concentrates energy and resources on opposing threats to his domain. The alienated non-innovators perceive inadequate autonomy in their work space, and thus remain either active in opposition to all administratively backed methods of teaching or apathetic toward them.

It is important to consider how various innovations affect faculty work space and their relations with other teachers and administrators. The administration provides the funds, equipment, hardware and technical staff and in return, they want to see the results of their expenditures--the quid pro quo. Thus, experimenting teachers have administrative and the off-campus visitors. The requirements of evaluation add more visitation and observation, tests and measurement of student learning. Administrators also set up rules for use of the new equipment, rules which have the effect of drawing teachers and their students out of separate classrooms and labs into media centers. The instructors become more exposed than they were while using traditional methods.

But, in addition to greater exposure to and interference from administrators, innovations also require greater exposure to other teachers which for some is as threatening as administrative inspection. Many new methods require team teaching or

new forms of groups commitment. For example, introductory courses run in an audio-tutorial arrangement may have a large group lecture and then small discussion groups or open labs where two or three teachers and aides rotate in handling student's questions, displays, assignments and problems with equipment. Thus, only one teacher assumes the traditional role of lecturer and the rest cooperate to plan the course. Gone is the solo practitioner who taught Introductory Composition any way he desired, regardless of how ten other introductory courses were taught.

Once a department decides to offer a standardized course requiring the use of new media, all teachers in the department must cooperate. The new learning systems have the additional characteristic of inflexibility--once they are established, one or two teachers cannot change practices but must persuade a majority of teachers that the course as taught is inadequate or undesirable. Changing whole subject-matter areas to a technological approach is a complex, political process as some teachers attempt to persuade and others attempt to resist.

Finally, it is important to note that teachers do not view their reactions to campus innovations as if these reactions were purely a political process where individuals and groups contend for power and protection of rights and territory. The negotiations occur in terms of practical realities of supplies, equipment, and budgets, but also in terms of ideologies and philosophies of teaching. Acceptable autonomy in one's work space means being able to choose the curricular emphasis, the textbooks and films, and the personal approach to teaching with which an individual feels comfortable. This area of professional ideology--involving personal values, beliefs and attitudes--is part of the work space that teachers most want to protect. These personal beliefs are not static or held in isolation from peers, and personal views of teaching constantly interact with those of a teacher's reference group. Teacher's

beliefs about the nature of teaching are susceptible to influence as part of the day-to-day negotiations between teachers and the administration.

In summary, changing instructional practices is clearly not so simple as purchasing new equipment or sending a teacher to a workshop on the merits of a new technique. Before faculty will adopt instructional practices foreign to them, they need a sense of autonomy in their work situation and the support and protection of their peers. This does not mean that there is an absolute and ideal level of autonomy for all teachers or that the more autonomy teachers have, the more they will experiment. But while institutional supports are necessary, they are of secondary importance; to be willing to experiment, the teacher first has to be satisfactorily assured that the supports still permit him the option of choosing whatever technique he believes to be best--in other words, to be certain his work space is not violated.

Many administrators believe a teaching innovation has been introduced successfully if they set up some hardware and see a few students using it (learning resource centers frequently fall into this category). But unless the concerned faculty perceive the innovation as a useful teaching device and incorporate it in their own teaching, it is an adjunct, doomed to remain on the periphery.

Administrators who succeed in encouraging sizable numbers of instructors to adopt new techniques respect the faculty work space. They set a climate that allows the instructors to take the lead in introducing the media, allowing time for the adoption process to take its own course. They do not badger the non-acceptors but try rather to understand what the proposed innovation means to them as people. In short, when they say the instructors are co-equal colleagues, they mean it.

Teachers choices of instructional methods, probably the most basic part of their work, is not in fact the private personal decision that many teachers would like to think it is. The more the method being considered requires institutionally provided equipment, staff assistance, peer cooperation and time and space in which to experiment, the more the decision becomes a shared one involving many groups in the institution. The clear distinction between administrative and faculty responsibility for the instructional process is no longer so easily determined, and in the process of negotiations, teachers must formulate the conditions under which they will experiment with and adopt new practices.

Bibliography

Baldridge, J. V. "Organizational Change: The Human Relations Perspective Versus the Political Systems Perspective." Educational Researcher, 1 (2), February, 1972, 4-10+.

Coleman, J., Katz, E., and Menzel, M. Medical Innovations. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.

Evans, R. I. and Leppman, P. Resistance in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Gaff, J. and Wilson, R. C. "The Teaching Environment," American Association of University Professors Bulletin. 57 (4), 1971, 475-493.

Glaser, B. G. "The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis." In Issues in Participant Observation, pp. 216-227. Edited by G. J. McCall and J. L. Simmons. Reading, Mass.; Addison-Wesley Publ., 1969.

Gross, N., Giacquinta, J. B., and Bernstein, M. An Attempt to Implement a Major Educational Innovation: A Sociological Inquiry. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Research and Development on Educational References, Harvard University, 1968.

Katz, E. "The Social Itinerary of Technical Change: Two Studies on the Diffusion of Innovation." In The Planning of Change, pp. 230-255. Edited by W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne and R. Chin. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Katz, E. and Lazarsfeld, P. F. Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the How of Mass Communications. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Lauer, R. H. "The Scientific Legitimation of Fallacy: Neutralizing Social Change Theory." American Sociological Review 36 (5), 1971, 881-889.

Purdy, L. P. A Case Study of Acceptance and Rejection of Innovation by Faculty in a Community College. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973. Ann Arbor, Mich., University Microfilms (Order No. 74-11563).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 06 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION